

**REMARKS:**

Claims 24-84 are in the case and have been subjected to a restriction requirement.

Applicant's elect Species 1 illustrated by Fig. 2. Before listing the claims which are believed entitled to examination commensurate with this election, it is noted that this election is made with traverse.

Firstly, it is noted that Fig. 4(a) and Fig. 4(b) are explanatory views of the embodiment of Fig. 2 so that there should in fact be no Species 3.

Fig. 6 is also a perspective view of the embodiment of Fig. 2 so likewise there should be no Species 5.

In addition, Fig. 5 (Species 4) is an alternative to Fig. 2 so that while a separate species may be appropriate, Species 1 and 4 are closely related. It is also noted that claim 25 which is directed to Species 2 / Fig. 3, is only a geometrically different alternative to the species of Fig. 1, with Fig. 7 being the perspective view of the embodiment of Fig. 3 so that no separate Species 6 should exist.

In any case, applicants have elected Species 1 / Fig. 2 for the purpose of making a complete response to the outstanding restriction requirement.

This is believed to entitle applicants to the examination of generic claim 24 as well as claims 28, 30, 32-34, 38-40, 44-50, 53, 76, 79, 81, 83 and 84.

Favorable action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Peter C. Michalos  
Reg. No. 28,643  
Attorney for Applicants  
(845) 359-7700

Dated: June 23, 2004

**NOTARO & MICHALOS P.C.**  
100 Dutch Hill Road, Suite 110  
Orangeburg, New York 10962-2100

**Customer No. 21706**